

Attorney Docket No. P16820-US1
Customer Number 27045

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

1.) Claim Amendments

The Applicant has amended claims 1-6 and claims 7-26 have been added. Accordingly, claims 1-26 are pending in the application. Support for the new claims can be found throughout the Specification. Applicant asserts that no new matter is contained herein. Favorable reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

2.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 102(b)

In paragraphs 1-2 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 1 and 5 under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Fu, et al. (US 5,226,127). Fu teaches the Intel microprocessor and a corresponding co-processor (the '386 processor and '387 math co-processor, as provided on a single chip in the Intel '486 microprocessor, including the pre-fetch circuitry of the '486). In Fu, a 3 clock cycle WAIT instruction is replaced by a one cycle null instruction. In contrast, in the present invention, the first processor is in a sleep state and the second processor is operating independently, whereas in Fu, the microprocessor and co-processor are described as both being in active states (e.g., the microprocessor is not in a sleep state while the co-processor is operating), although the microprocessor of Fu is waiting while the second processor is in operation (See Column 5, lines 1-25 of Fu). Thus, in Fu, there is a dependence of the co-processor on its corresponding microprocessor, whereas in the present invention, the second processor can act independently of the first processor. Also, both the first (host) processor and second (shadow) processor of the present invention operate in parallel, whereas in Fu, the microprocessor is waiting for a signal as when the co-processor has completed its operation (although the number of clock cycles of the wait operation is reduced). Although there are fundamental differences between the present invention and Fu, Applicant has amended Claims 1 and 5 to further emphasize the differences.

Therefore, the allowance of claims 1 and 5 is respectfully requested.

Amendment - PAGE 8 of 10
EUS/J/P/05-9238

Attorney Docket No. P16820-US1
Customer Number 27045

3.) Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

In paragraphs 4-5 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejected claims 2-4 and 6 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fu in view of Kawahara, et al. (US 5,614,847). Kawahara discloses a semiconductor IC adapted to save power by going from an active to an inactive state. Applicant respectfully submits that Kawahara does not remedy the defects of Fu as Kawahara does not teach the ability of second (shadow) processor to operate independently of the first (host) processor. Nevertheless, the Applicant has amended the claims 2-4 and 6 to better distinguish the claimed invention from Fu and Kawahara. Claims 2-4 depend from amended claim 1 and recite further limitations in combination with the novel elements of claim 1. Claim 6 depends from amended claim 5 and recite further limitations in combination with the novel elements of claim 5. Therefore, the allowance of claims 1-6 is respectfully requested.

Attorney Docket No. P16820-US1
Customer Number 27045

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing remarks, the Applicant believes all of the claims currently pending in the Application to be in a condition for allowance. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw all rejections and issue a Notice of Allowance for all pending claims.

The Applicant requests a telephonic interview if the Examiner has any questions or requires any additional information that would further or expedite the prosecution of the Application.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael Cameron
Registration No. 50,298

Date: November 14, 2005

Ericsson Inc.
6300 Legacy Drive, M/S EVR 1-C-11
Plano, Texas 75024

(972) 583-4145
michael.cameron@ericsson.com